

Multi-Similarity Loss with GPW for Deep Metric Learning

Supplementary Material

1. Introduction

This supplementary material provides more details of General Pair Weighting (GPW) framework and Multi-Similarity (MS) loss. First, we further revisit three existing pair-based loss functions under our GPW framework. Then, we analyze the limitation of direct combination of binomial deviance loss [6] and lifted structure loss [1] (referred as BinLifted), compared to our weighting scheme. Finally, we analyze the impact of batch-size to the proposed MS loss with experiments conducted on CUB200 and SOP datasets.

2. Revisit Pair-based Loss Functions

In this section, we further analyze three recent pair-based loss functions in addition to those presented in the main paper: N-pairs loss [3], NCA loss [2] and histogram loss [4].

N-pairs Loss. Sohn *et al.* [3] proposed a N-pairs loss, which is a special case of the lifted structure loss by only considering single positive pair. It can be analyzed by following the same process of analyzing the lifted structure loss in the main paper, as shown in Eq. (6)-(8).

NCA Loss. Salakhutdinov *et al.* [2] introduced a NCA loss to learn a nonlinear embedding to optimize the classification performance of a soft-KNN classifier:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{nca} &:= \sum_{i=1}^m \log \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{y}_k=\mathbf{y}_i} e^{S_{ik}}}{\sum_{i=1}^m e^{S_{ik}}} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \left[\log \sum_{\mathbf{y}_k=\mathbf{y}_i} e^{S_{ik}} - \log \sum_{i=1}^m e^{S_{ik}} \right].\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

By following GPW framework, the weight of a pair $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j\}$, *i.e.*, w_{ij} , can be derived from differentiating \mathcal{L}_{nca} with respect to S_{ij} :

$$\begin{aligned}w_{ij}^+ &= \frac{e^{S_{ij}}}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}_k=\mathbf{y}_i} e^{S_{ik}}} - \frac{e^{S_{ij}}}{\sum_{i=1}^m e^{S_{ik}}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}_k=\mathbf{y}_i} e^{S_{ik}-S_{ij}}} - \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^m e^{S_{ik}-S_{ij}}}, \\ w_{ij}^- &= \frac{e^{S_{ij}}}{\sum_{i=1}^m e^{S_{ik}}} = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^m e^{S_{ik}-S_{ij}}}.\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

As can be found in Eq. 2, the weight for a positive pair or a negative pair is calculated based on its relative similarities, which compute a similarity between a current pair and its neighboring pairs. The NCA loss focuses on hard negative pairs and the high-confident positive pairs, collected from the neighboring pairs of an anchor point, in the embedding space.

Histogram Loss. Ustinova *et al.* [4] designed a histogram loss based on quadruplets, which can be formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_{hist} &:= \sum_{r=1}^R (h_r^- \sum_{q=1}^r h_q^+) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^R (\sum_{q=1}^r h_q^+) h_r^- \\ &= \sum_{q=1}^R (\sum_{r=q}^R h_r^-) h_q^+\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

where R is the dimension of a histogram for positive or negative cosine similarities. h_q^+ is the histogram estimation at node q of the cosine similarity for a positive pair, and h_r^- is that of a negative pair at node r .

$$h_r^+ = \frac{1}{|S^+|} \sum_{\mathbf{y}_i=\mathbf{y}_j} \delta_{ijr}, \quad (4)$$

where δ_{ijr} is defined as:

$$\delta_{ijr} = \begin{cases} (S_{ij} - t_{r-1})/\Delta, & S_{ij} \in [t_{r-1}, t_r], \\ (t_{r+1} - S_{ij})/\Delta, & S_{ij} \in [t_r, t_{r+1}], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $\Delta = 2/(R-1)$, $t_r = r\Delta - 1$. Estimation of h_q^- is computed analogously.

To better understanding histogram loss within our GPW framework, we first provide the following formulations (more details can be found in [4]),




Figure 1. Limitations of the BinLifted weighting scheme: (i) in case-1, the negative pair on the bottom, which is of much lower cosine similarity than the top one, will be assigned with a larger weight; (ii) in case-2, a negative pair is fixed when the neighboring negative samples move closer to the anchor, which reduce the relative similarity (*Similarity-N*) of the negative pair.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{hist}}{\partial h_q^+} &= \sum_{r=q}^R h^- \\ \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{hist}}{\partial h_r^-} &= \sum_{q=1}^r h^+ \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

For a positive pair S_{ij}

$$\frac{\partial h_r^+}{\partial S_{ij}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\Delta|\mathcal{S}^+|}, & S_{ij} \in [t_{r-1}, t_r], \\ \frac{-1}{\Delta|\mathcal{S}^+|}, & S_{ij} \in [t_r, t_{r+1}], \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $|\mathcal{S}^+|$ is the number of positive pairs. Then we have

$$\frac{\partial h_r^-}{\partial S_{ij}} = 0, \quad (8)$$

since h_r^- is calculated from negative pairs, and thus is unrelated to the similarities of positive pairs, S_{ij} .

Finally, the partial derivative of \mathcal{L}_{hist} w.r.t. the similarity of a positive pair $S_{ij} \in [t_p, t_{p+1}]$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{hist}}{\partial S_{ij}} &= \sum_{q=1}^R \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{hist}}{\partial h_q^+} \frac{\partial h_q^+}{\partial S_{ij}} + \sum_{r=1}^R \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{hist}}{\partial h_r^-} \frac{\partial h_r^-}{\partial S_{ij}} \\ &= \sum_{q=1}^R \left(\sum_{r=q}^R h_r^- \right) \frac{\partial h_q^+}{\partial S_{ij}} \\ &= \left(\sum_{r=p}^R h_r^- \right) \frac{\partial h_p^+}{\partial S_{ij}} + \left(\sum_{r=p+1}^R h_r^- \right) \frac{\partial h_{p+1}^+}{\partial S_{ij}} \quad (9) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Delta|\mathcal{S}^+|} \left(\sum_{r=p+1}^R h_r^- - \sum_{r=p}^R h_r^- \right) \\ &= \frac{-1}{\Delta|\mathcal{S}^+|} h_p^-. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the weight value assigned to this positive pair is $\frac{1}{\Delta|\mathcal{S}^+|} h_p^-$. Similarly, for a negative pair with a cosine similarity of $S_{ij} \in [t_p, t_{p+1}]$, the weight under a histogram loss is $\frac{1}{\Delta|\mathcal{S}^-|} h_{p+1}^+$.

Though with complicated formulation and rough derivation, pair weight scheme of histogram loss can be presented in an extremely concise and clear form, as shown in Eq. 9. h_p^- is approximately the ratio of negative pairs which have a lower cosine similarity compared with the current positive pair, and $\frac{1}{\Delta|\mathcal{S}^+|}$ can be regarded as a fixed normalizer. Similarly, the weight of a negative pair is the ratio of positive pairs having a lower cosine similarity than the current negative one. Therefore, the weighting scheme clearly indicates that a histogram loss estimates pair weights only based on *Similarity-P*, e.g., by comparing the negative pairs with the positive ones, and vice versa. This may reduce the performance of histogram loss, leading to lower performance than that of binomial deviance loss on the CUB200 and SOP, as reported in [4].

3. BinLifted v.s. MS Weighting

As discussed in the main paper, our MS loss is related to a direct combination of binomial deviance loss and lifted structure loss (referred as BinLifted), by jointly considering both *Similarity-S* and *Similarity-N*. In our ablation study presented in Section 5.1 (in main paper), we show by experiments that our weighting scheme is superior to that of BinLifted. Here we explain the benefits of our iterative mining and weighting scheme. Given an example of a negative pair $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j\}$, the weight computed by Binlifted weighting scheme \hat{w}_{ij} is:

$$\hat{w}_{ij} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{e^{\beta(S_{ij}-\lambda)}}{1 + e^{\beta(S_{ij}-\lambda)}} + \frac{e^{\beta S_{ij}}}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}_k \neq \mathbf{y}_i} e^{\beta S_{ik}}} \right). \quad (10)$$

From Eq. 10, the weight of BinLifted satisfies:

$$\hat{w}_{ij} > \frac{1}{2} \max \left(\frac{e^{\beta(S_{ij}-\lambda)}}{1 + e^{\beta(S_{ij}-\lambda)}}, \frac{e^{\beta S_{ij}}}{\sum_{\mathbf{y}_k \neq \mathbf{y}_i} e^{\beta S_{ik}}} \right). \quad (11)$$

which provides a lower bound for the weighting by BinLifted method. We found that a negative pair with a large relative similarity, will have a weight of $\frac{e^{\beta S_{ij}}}{\sum_{y_k \neq y_i} e^{\beta S_{ik}}}$ which is close to 1, so that BinLifted method will assign a large weight to this pair, and ignore or reduce the impact from *Similarity-S*. As shown in case-1 of Fig. 1, a negative pair on the bottom has a much lower *Similarity-S* than the negative pair on the top, but BinLifted will compute a similar weight for the two pairs. Furthermore, when the *Similarity-S* of a pair is higher than a threshold λ , the weight will be computed as $\frac{e^{\beta(S_{ij}-\lambda)}}{1+e^{\beta(S_{ij}-\lambda)}}$, which can be a large value, regardless of *Similarity-N*. As illustrated in case-2 of Fig. 1, two negative pairs on the bottom will be assigned with a similar weight, due to large values of *Similarity-S*, while omitting the large difference on the relative similarities (*Similarity-N*) between the two pairs. However, a negative pair on the top of case-2 will also be assigned with a similar weight to the bottom one, even its *Similarity-S* is much larger.

In summary, BinLifted estimates the weight of a pair by mainly considering the larger value computed from *Similarity-S* or *Similarity-N*, while neglecting the smaller one. This drawback may reduce the performance considerably, which can be even lower than that of using a single binomial deviance loss, as shown in the ablation study.

In contrast, our MS weighting is able to compute the weight for a negative pair dynamically:

$$w_{ij} = \frac{e^{\beta(S_{ij}-\lambda)}}{1 + \sum_{y_k \neq y_i} e^{\beta(S_{ik}-\lambda)}}. \quad (12)$$

which addresses the issue raised in case-1 and case-2 of Fig. 1. This allows it to explore more meaningful information from both *Similarity-S* and *Similarity-N* (Eq. 12), rather than only focusing on the single one with the larger value. Positive pairs can be analyzed analogously.

4. Effect of Batch Size

To analyze the performance of our MS loss with different batch-size, we conduct experiments on the SOP [1] and CUB200 [5] datasets. We set the embedding size to 512 and $K = 5$, and use Adam optimizer with a learning rate of 10^{-5} for all experiments. The recall@1 performance of MS loss on the CUB200 and the SOP are reported in Tables 1 and 2, with batch-size set at $\{20, 40, 80, 160, 240\}$ and $\{20, 40, 80, 160, 320, 640, 1000\}$ respectively.

We observed that batch-size effects the performance of MS loss differently on the CUB200 and SOP: (i) the CUB200 is less sensitive to the change of batch-size than the SOP; (ii) the performance on the CUB200 decreases when the batch-size is increased, while the performance on the SOP benefits from large batch-sizes significantly.

We found that the batch-size impacts a dataset with large inter-class variations more significantly than the small ones.

The CUB200 is a fine-grained dataset with smaller inter-class variations than the SOP, making it easier to collect hard negative pairs with subtle difference. However, by using a small batch-size of 20 on the SOP dataset, our MS mining is difficult to collect any informative pair at some iterations, which happened at over 20% iterations in our experiments. Therefore, a large batch-size, e.g., > 320 , is required for a dataset with large variations like the SOP. This ensures it to collect enough hard negative pairs, which are meaningful to train a discriminative model, and thus improve the performance.

Batch-size	Recall@1 (%)
20	64.75
40	65.07
80	65.65
160	65.43
240	64.60

Table 1. Recall@1 performance of MS loss at the batch-size of $\{20, 40, 80, 120, 160, 240\}$ on the CUB200 database.

Batch-size	Recall@1 (%)
20	71.40
40	73.82
80	75.61
160	76.63
320	77.59
640	78.19
1000	78.35

Table 2. Recall@1 performance of MS loss at the batch-size of $\{20, 40, 80, 160, 320, 640\}$ on the SOP database.

References

- [1] H. Oh Song, Y. Xiang, S. Jegelka, and S. Savarese. Deep metric learning via lifted structured feature embedding. In *CVPR*, 2016. 1, 3
- [2] R. Salakhutdinov and G. Hinton. Learning a nonlinear embedding by preserving class neighbourhood structure. In *AISTATS*, 2007. 1
- [3] K. Sohn. Improved deep metric learning with multi-class n-pair loss objective. In *NIPS*. 2016. 1
- [4] E. Ustinova and V. Lempitsky. Learning deep embeddings with histogram loss. In *NIPS*. 2016. 1, 2
- [5] C. Wah, S. Branson, P. Welinder, P. Perona, and S. Belongie. The Caltech-UCSD Birds-200-2011 Dataset. Master’s thesis, 2011. 3
- [6] D. Yi, Z. Lei, and S. Z. Li. Deep metric learning for practical person re-identification. *arXiv:1407.4979*, 2014. 1